

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 46 and 47 have been indicated as being allowable. Claims 49, 50 and 52 are indicated as allowable, but stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Claims 49, 50 and 52 have been amended to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Therefore, upon entry of the present response, claims 46, 47, 49, 50 and 52 will remain pending.

The specification has been amended as per the Examiner's suggestion. In particular, page 2, lines 11-13 of the present specification have been amended to refer to Figures 4a-4h. Accordingly, applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the objection to the present specification.

Claims 46 and 47 have been indicated as being allowable and claims 49, 50 and 52 are indicated as allowable, but stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for indicating allowability of claims 46, 47, 49, 50 and 52. Applicants have amended claims 49, 50 and 52 to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

Claims 49, 50 and 52 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. In particular, with regard to claim 49, the office action suggests that the phrase "electronic card assembly deflecting less than the PCMCIA standard during a PCMCIA bend test which applies a force of approximately 20N" is unclear allegedly because applicants have failed to disclose the PCMCIA standard value of the PCMCIA bend test. (*Office Action dated December 29, 2003 at p. 3*). In addition, with regard to claim 52, the office action suggests that the phrase "card displacing less than the

PCMCIA standard during a fingernail test which applies a force of more than approximately 100N” is unclear allegedly because applicants have failed to disclose the PCMCIA standard during a fingernail test. (*Office Action dated December 29, 2003 at p. 3*).

Applicants have amended claims 49, 50 and 52 to remove recitation to the PCMCIA standard tests recited above. Support for the present amendments to claims 49, 50 and 52 is found throughout the present specification, and particularly on page 11, lines 11-13 and Tables I through III on pages 17-19.

Accordingly, applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claims 49, 50 and 52 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

Although continuity to application Serial No. 08/748,503 filed on November 8, 1996, was claimed in the declaration filed with the present application on July 27, 2001, such priority claim was not acknowledged on the filing receipt. An amendment to the present specification also was filed on November 18, 2002 adding the continuity information. The amendment to the specification was acknowledged by the Examiner. Therefore, the same continuity information is now submitted with a Petition to Accept Delayed Claim of Priority together with the fee of \$1,330.00. Applicants respectfully request acceptance of the Petition to Accept Unintentionally Delayed Claim for Priority Pursuant to 37 CFR 1.79(a)(3).

DOCKET NO.: FCI-2699/4450G
Application No.: 09/916,491
Office Action Dated: December 29, 2003

PATENT

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing remarks, the present application is believed to be in condition for allowance, and a Notice of Allowability is respectfully solicited. In the event that the Examiner cannot allow the present application for any reason, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned attorney Vincent J. Roccia at (215) 564-8946 to discuss resolution of any remaining issues.

Date: March 4, 2004



Vincent J. Roccia
Registration No. 43,887

Woodcock Washburn LLP
One Liberty Place - 46th Floor
Philadelphia PA 19103
Telephone: (215) 568-3100
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439